LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

FILED
NOV 15 1974
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

In the

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1974

No. ~~74-589~~

FRANCES HILLIARD BROWN,
Petitioner,

versus

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER AT DALLAS, TEXAS,
Respondent,

BAYLOR SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, NEUROLOGICAL RESEARCH DIVISION AT HOUSTON, TEXAS,
Respondent,

SCOTT & WHITE CLINIC and DR. R. K. GAINES, at Temple, Texas,
Respondent.

Petition For A Writ of Certiorari To The United States Court of Appeals For The Fifth Circuit

FRANCES HILLIARD BROWN,
Petitioning in her own behalf,
4700 Abbott, Apartment 12,
Dallas, Texas 75205.

SOUTHWESTERN LAW PRESS — DALLAS, TEXAS — (214) 742-4257

INDEX

	Page
Citations	ii
Opinions Below	2
Jurisdiction	2
Questions Presented	2
Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved	3
Statement of the Cast	3
Reasons for Granting the Writ	8
Conclusion	13
Certificate of Service	14
Appendix A — Amendments and Statutes	A-1
Appendix B — Memorandum to District Court	B-1
Appendix C — Order of District Court	C-1
Appendix D — Judgment of 5th Circuit Court of Appeals	D-1
Appendix E — Per Curiam: Affirmed, 5th Circuit	E-1
Appendix F — Information on The Brain Changers	F-1

Table of Citations

Cases — **Page**

Taggert v. City of Grand Prairie, 421 F. 2d 1301 (1970) 7

Lamont v. Postmaster General, 381 U.S. 301, 307 (1965) .. 9

Mrs. Jack D. Fowler v. So. Bell Telephone Co., et al., 343 F. 2d 150 (5th Circuit) 12

Larry Clonce v. Elliott Richardson, 73-CV 373 11

Amendments

First 2, 3, 4, 9

Fourth 2, 3, 4

Thirteenth 2, 3, 11

Statutes

Title III, Section 2511 of the Omnibus and Safe Street Acts 3, 6, 7

Title 42, Section 1983 of the U.S.C. 3, 6, 11

Title 28, Section1331(a) of the U.S.C. 3, 6

Miscellaneous

Rule 12 FRCP 5

Rule 56 FRCP 12

Fifth Circuit — Local Rule 21(1) 2, 8

Yale Law Journal, Vol. 82, Page 1464-65 (Privacy) 9

The Brain Changers by Maya Pines 10

In the

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1974

No. .....

In the Matter of the Infringement Upon The Constitutional Rights of the Petitioner

FRANCES HILLIARD BROWN,
Petitioner,

versus

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER AT DALLAS, TEXAS,
Respondent,

BAYLOR SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, NEUROLOGICAL RESEARCH DIVISION AT HOUSTON, TEXAS,
Respondent,

SCOTT & WHITE CLINIC and DR. R. K. GAINES, at Temple, Texas,
Respondent.

Petition For A Writ of Certiorari To The United States Court of Appeals For The Fifth Circuit

Petitioner prays that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the final judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, which upheld the Order of the District Court for the Northern District of Texas dismissing the petitioner's complaint for lack of Federal Jurisdiction.

CITATION TO OPINIONS BELOW

The Order of the District Court below was unaccompanied by a detailed opinion except to say that it considered the defendant's motions to dismiss well founded*[1] and that it lacked federal jurisdiction. The Order is printed in Appendix C hereto. The Judgment of the Circuit Court of Appeals upholding the Order of the District Court under local Rule 21.[1] is printed in Appendix D hereto.

JURISDICTION

The final judgment of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was entered on September 27, 1974 and is appended hereto at page ..... The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254.[1]

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

(1) Does the use of electronic devices implanted within the human body for the purpose of control, harrassment, and experimentation go beyond a simple tort or injury and violate the rights of the individual as guaranteed by the United States Constitution.

(2) Does the implantation of electrodes for the purpose of inhibiting the action of an individual constitute an abridgement of the freedom of speech clause of the First Amendment, and the protection afforded by the involuntary servitude provision of the Thirteenth.

(3) Does the use of such an electronic network, created by special interest groups, open the way to possible oppressive coercion by political parties or government agencies. And stand as a direct violation of the right to privacy as guaranteed by the Fourth Amendment

[1] See memorandum to the District Court regarding possible irregularities in the court proceedings printed in Appendix B p ___

and the further protection provided in Title III of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Street Acts of 1968, Section 2511.

(4) In such circumstances is it not conceivable that the cloak of National Security could be used by unethical government officials to hide a multitude of injustices against innocent individuals — extending even to the protection of organized crime.

Settlement of these questions by this Court are of overwhelming public importance in as much as advanced scientific technology makes the surreptitious use of electronic implants capable of touching and destroying the lives and happiness of millions of Americans.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The principal constitutional provisions involved are the First, Fourth, and possibly the Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. As well as Title III, Section 2511 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, Title 42, Section 1983 U.S.C. and Title 28, Section 1331 (a) U.S.C. (The pertinent text of the aforementioned provisions are set forth in Appendix A hereto, pp. A-1, 2).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On February 7, 1974, the petitioner filed a complaint in the United States District Court primarily because of the constitutional violations involved, and also as the respondents are recipients of federal grants and assistance, the case should properly come under federal jurisdiction. Of less importance, but never-the-less a factor, was the consideration that Texas does not have a "Right to Privacy Law" under which similar

charges could be brought or relief obtained in a State Court.

The complaint alleged the constitutional rights of the petitioner as guaranteed by the First and Fourth Amendment had been violated by Baylor University Medical Center at Dallas, the Neurological Research Division of Baylor School of Medicine at Houston, and by Scott & White Clinic and their Staff Member, a psychiatrist, Dr. R. K. Gaines of Temple, Texas. This violation taking the form of electronic devices implanted within her body, and the resultant use of these devices by the respondents and others to monitor the thoughts and actions and to a certain extent manipulate and control the petitioner.

The complaint also charged Scott & White Clinic with further abuses in that they, without telling the petitioner of the extent and capabilities of the electronic devices, attempted to transfer her to a state mental hospital. The complaint asked for monetary damages, both actual and punitive and for medical or injunctive relief. (R 1-3).

The petitioner is fifty-nine years old, and until caught up in the circumstances which prompts this action in the federal courts, has worked and supported herself. Presently she is deriving her income from the sale of a Nebraska farm. She has never engaged in or been connected with any organization promoting or advocating the change or overthrow of the United States Government.

It might be well to mention at the outset of this statement, the petitioner is not an attorney. Out of the fifty or more attorneys approached for help, only one offered legal assistance. And at the time the offer was made, the petitioner knew so little of the extent of the electronic monitoring, or that the

devices were capable of altering and controlling behavior, that filing a law suit did not seem the right course to pursue. Consequently this petition for Certiorari will rely more upon facts, the questions presented and the issues involved than upon decisions which have been handed down in other cases. Indeed, it is possible that no similar case has reached the courts so that a decision could be made which would serve as a guide.

On March 4, 1974 the respondents filed separate answers to the complaint moving for dismissal under Rule 12 FRCP (lack of jurisdiction because of no diversity of citizenship and the fact that no federal question was alleged) and asking for a more definite statement. (R 4-15 and 17-18).

On April 10, 1974 a Hearing was held in the District Court for the Northern District of Texas on the respondents "Motion to Dismiss" for lack of jurisdiction. During the hearing the petitioner pointed out that constitutional violations were involved, while the respondents maintained that no federal question had been raised (R 69-70). The petitioner also mentioned the possibility of communications running from her person to other parts of the country thus indirectly opening the avenue to possible F.C.C. rules violations (R-71).

On May 22, 1974 the petitioner filed written interrogatories to be asked of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in Dallas, Channel 4 Television in Dallas and the Southwestern Bell Telephone Company. And on May 28 sent subpoenaes to permit inspection and discovery on the premises of the respondents. (R 40, 42, 46, 48) On May 28 before any of these could be executed, the Case was dismissed.

The corrected "Order of Dismissal" filed by the District Court on June 3, 1974 is as follows: (Printed in Appendix B p ....)

> Having heard the respective motions to dismiss of the defendants of April 10, 1974, and having considered all pleadings and other matters of record as of that date, and having further considered the record in this matter subsequent to that date, the Court concludes that defendants' motions are well-founded and that it lacks jurisdiction of this cause."

The petitioner filed a Notice of Appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. The case was placed on the Summary Calendar.

Following the dismissal of the case by the District Court, the petitioner went on the premises of the respondents, simply as the individual concerned, and asked to see the records. This effort met with no success, (Appellant's Brief — page 14) whereupon she filed a motion to perpetuate testimony pending appeal with the District Court. (R 53-56) The respondents filed a motion to stay discovery and the Court did not act on either motion.

In the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, despite the briefs which the petitioner filed with the Fifth Circuit mentioning Title 28 of U.S.C. — Section 1331 (a) which reads:

> The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions wherein the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of $10,000 exclusive of interests and costs and arises under the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States.

or the possible violation of Title 42 — Section 1983 (printed in Appendix A, pp A-1, 2) and Title III of the Omnibus Crime

Control and Safe Street Acts of 1968, Section 2511; which specifically states:

> Section 2511 provides that anyone who attempts or willfully uses wiretapping or other electronic devices to intercept any wire or oral communication is guilty of violating the Act when: (1) the device used is connected or otherwise transmits a signal through material used in wire communications or (2) the device used transmits communications by radio or interferes with these transmissions (Appellant's brief — pages 8 and 11).

the respondents in their brief still maintain the petitioner was simply a victim of a tort or assault (Appellees' brief — page 6). And quoted from an opinion given by the Fifth Circuit in *Taggart v. City of Grand Prarie*, 421 F. 2d 1301 (1970):

> "It is apparent from the allegations that appellants were deprived of no federally protected right * * * Any rights which appellants might have can be adequately determmined by state law" — Appellee's Brief — page 7.

It is incomprehensible to the petitioner how the attorneys for the respondents, who were in a position to know of the far reaching radius of the electronic equipment, and who knew that Texas does not have a "Right to Privacy Law", could continue to maintain the case was simply one of injury which could be settled in the state court. This, in itself, constitutes an obstruction of justice and denial of relief to the petitioner of unprecedented proportions.

In the petitioner's opinion, the case should never have gone to the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit on a jurisdictional question. Unless, of course, it went down as the result of a surreptious motion as to the mental competency of the petitioner. If so, the motion was kept off of the docket and out

of the record by one of the attorneys for the respondents, and the petitioner had no opportunity to reply to or refute whatever the motion alleged (See memorandum to the District Court, Appendix B, pp B-1, 2).

On September 27, 1974 the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit handed down a decision "Per Curiam": Affirmed. in accordance with Local Rule 21 (1). Local Rule 21(1) states that "a judgment of the District Court is based on findings of fact which are not clearly erroneous" (opinion and judgment printed in Appendix E.)

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

The issues involved in this case are so fundamental to our democratic way of life that unless more than a cursory glance is taken by the Courts, that way of life will vanish. Quietly and stealthly our fundamental rights are being eaten away by an electronic network of surveilance so vast that without the help of legal restrictions and investigatory action, the average citizen cannot combat it. This case presents a plea for the laws which will enable the individual to once again direct his or her own life despite the power which has been given to the huge conglomerates and government by new electronic technology.

While the case comes to this Court upon a jurisdictional issue which the petitioner believes was mistakenly handed down by the District Court, so interwoven are the issues involved with the question of jurisdiction that the two are inseparable.

I

Brain Implants — Transistors and Transmitters

With the technical ability to implant electronic devices of

a transmitting nature in an individual without their knowledge or consent, that individual is in the position of a fly seeking escape upon a pane of glass. Every move to secure help is known and can be blocked, and as these devices are capable of transmitting speech, normal communication with others is impossible. As the Court has recognized in *Lamont v. Postmaster General,* 381 U.S. 301, 307 (1965):

> The Court has recognized the participation of individuals in a free expression system can be inhibited or chilled in a variety of ways and the result is to diminish the self-governing rights of at least those individuals — Yale Law Journal 82, Page 1464-65.

The terrible isolation of existing in an atmosphere where speech and even thoughts can be monitored can be known only by one who has experienced it. It is a complete and total violation of the freedom of speech clause in the First Amendment. That the self-protective motives of the huge conglomerates have replaced the oppressive coalition of the church and state, so feared by the founding fathers, does not alter the constitutional violations committed. As the past few years of the "watergate" investigations has shown, the heavy contributions of the conglomerates to election campaigns enables them to form an alliance with the government and its various agencies. This oppressive power ruins lives and in a multitude of ways deprives an individual of their right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It is not the place to mention in this petition the individuals in government agencies who have attempted in an ineffectual way to help the petitioner. But individuals in those agencies faced with demotion, harrassment and loss of a job, simply in this instance, coult not oppose the power arrayed against them.

II

Brain Implants — Use of Electrodes

As subtle and as equally damaging is the use of electrodes. These, depending upon their location in the brain, can be used to produce the emotion of rage, or to inhibit the actions of an individual, and to induce a deep sleep. (The Brain Changers by Maya Pines, Page 37) And it is the petitioner's belief that it is the electrode implanted within the hypothalamus gland in this instance which has caused much of the resultant injuries. As Miss Pines points out in her book (Page 228). (See information on Miss Pines in Appendix F.)

> "It doesn't take much paranoia in such circumstances to see impending political plots — against blacks, leftists, women or any other section of the population."

The petitioner believes that in her case the reason for these implants was partially experimentation, and partially to commit her to an asylum before she discovered the wide range of the transmitting devices (R pp 2, 35, 36). There is nothing the matter with the mental ability of the petitioner and never has been, except in those instances when the electrodes are manipulated to alter behavior patterns. One of the thoughts which has continued to haunt the petitioner is the hundreds of people whose brain may have been tampered with in any one of a variety of ways and who have been committed to untold suffering in a mental institution.

To accomplish this, gaining the necessary cooperation of relatives by the authorities, is usually fairly simple. This can be done either through exerting economic pressure of one kind or another, or the skillful manipulation of those who are not aware of what has been done or why.

Surely these practices can be halted under the involuntary servitude provision of the Thirteenth Amendment or Title 42 — Sec. 1983 of the U.S.C.

One Federal Judge, Judge John Oliver in Kansas City, has outlawed behavior modification for inmates at the U.S. Medical Center for Federal Prisoners at Springfield, Mo. (*Larry Clonce v. Elliott Richardson*, 73-CV 373) (See appellant's reply brief, pp 4) Surely it is time for this Court to similarly rule to protect Americans in every walk of life from this new and subtle encroachment upon their freedom of speech, right to privacy and to protection from involuntary servitude.

III

Brain Implants — Organized Crime and National Security

Perhaps more far reaching than any other issue in this case, and one which could be overlooked by everyone except the criminal element and law enforcement groups, is the presence of organized crimes. Quick to move into any situation where the laws are lax or non-existant and the profits in drug running, pornography and book making are enormous, their skilled technicians are able to tie into a communication network and maintain contact with their counterparts in almost any part of the world. Hiding under the almost perfect cover provided by electronic connections in a hapless individual, they can thus use a perfectly legitimate communication network such as I. T. & T. and/or A. T. & T. and the multitude of private watt lines criss-crossing the country and overseas.

That anyone should try to pull the cloak of National Security over these activities is manifestly ridiculous. While the govern-

ment would no doubt, like to keep the extent of its overseas communications secret, with every University, Technical School, Medical Research Center and organized crime making use of the network, it is time to take steps to protect the average American citizen and to guarantee that the personal freedoms which he has every right to expect are preserved.

IV

Possible Irregularities and Conflicts in the Decisions Below

(1) Did the District Court base it's opinion as to jurisdiction upon a motion filed by the attorneys for Scott & White alleging mental incompetency. A motion which the petitioner did not see, which was not put on the docket, and which she had no opportunity to refute. If so, this was highly irregular and unethical especially as the mental incompetency statement is one of the causes of action against Scott & White.

(2) Did the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit reverse itself in this instance, when in the matter of *Mrs. Jack D. Fowler v. Southern Bell Telephone Co. et al,* 343 F 2d 150 (An Action for Invasion of Privacy by Wire Tapping).

In finding for the Appellant, Part 4 of the opinion reads in pertinent part:

> "In the present case, the District Court went beyond the complaint and apparently based its dismissal on the verified removal petitions. The motions were thus treated as motions for summary judgment and the narrow question before us is whether the defendants carried their burden of showing that there was no genuine issue as to any material fact and that they were entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Rule 56 FRCP.

CONCLUSION

Because of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution to every American which should be kept inviolate, and because of the statutes and rules which have been disregarded in this case, it is respectfully prayed that a Writ of Certiorari be granted to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit which upheld the opinion of the District Court.

For the above reasons this Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

FRANCES HILLIARD BROWN,
Petitioning in her own behalf,
4700 Abbott, Apartment 12,
Dallas, Texas 75205.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that three copies of this Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit have been sent to each of the attorneys listed below by certified United States Mail:

Baylor University Medical Center at Dallas, Texas
Mr. James H. Holmes III, Counsel for Respondent
1500 Fidelity Union Life Building
Dallas, Texas 75201

* * *

Baylor School of Medicine-Neurological Research Division
at Houston, Texas
Mr. C. A. Searcy Miller, Counsel for Respondent
3100 Fidelity Union Tower
Dallas, Texas 75201

* * *

Scott & White Clinic w/ Dr. R. K. Gaines
at Temple, Texas
Mr. Jack Pew, Jr., Counsel for Respondent
4300 First National Bank Building
Dallas, Texas 75202

.....
Frances Hilliard Brown

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

PERTINENT TEXT OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

First Amendment

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or *abridging the freedom of speech,* or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Fourth Amendment

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated; and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Thirteenth Amendment

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Title III of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Acts of 1968 — Section 2511 — Pertinent part thereof

Section 2511 provides that anyone who attempts or willfully uses wiretapping or other electronic devices to intercept any wire or oral communication is guilty of violating the Act when: (1) the device used is connected or other wise transmits a signal through material used in wire communications or (2) the device

used transmits communications by radio or interfere with these transmissions.

Title 42 — Section 1983 U.S.C.

Every person who under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage of any State or Territory, subjects or causes to be subjected any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress.

Title 28 — Section 1331 (a)

The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions wherein the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of $10,000 exclusive of interests and costs and arises under the Constitution laws or treaties of the United States.

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS, TEXAS

FRANCES HILLIARD BROWN)
4700 ABBOTT-APARTMENT 12) Plaintiff
DALLAS, TEXAS 75205)

versus

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY MEDICAL)
CENTER AT DALLAS, ET. AL.) Defendants

MEMORANDUM TO JUDGE ELDON B. MAHON REGARDING POSSIBLE IRREGULARITIES IN THE ABOVE NUMBERED CASE.

In preparing the material in this case for a petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States, the plaintiff noticed what might possibly be an error or irregularity. And if such an error exists, it could have a bearing on the decision rendered by the district court.

In the Minutes of the Hearing held on April 10, 1974 (page 8) the following is found:

THE COURT: Are the Briefs in here?
MR. HARTMAN, ATT'Y SCOTT & WHITE: Yes, sir, here's a copy of it. It might be helpful.

* * *

THE COURT: Is there anything further anybody wants to offer with regard to this?
MR. HOLMES, ATT'Y BAYLOR-DALLAS: No, your Honor, I was just — I did not file a Brief, but Mr. Hartman's Brief is to the point and I would rely on that, sir, if it's all right with the Court.

At the time of the Hearing, the plaintiff assumed the Brief referred to was one which had been filed with the clerk on March 5, 1974. However, since you, the Judge, would have read the material relevant to the case before calling the Hearing, the plaintiff is now wondering if Mr. Hartman presented an amended Brief which was not subsequently filed with the clerk, did not get on the docket which went to the Court of Appeals, and to which the plaintiff did not have an opportunity to respond.

Since the Judge would naturally assume that any Brief presented to the court would be filed with the clerk, the plaintiff is not questioning any irregularity on the part of the Court, but rather an error on the part of the attorneys involved.

It would be appreciated if this could be investigated and if the error is substantiated, proper steps taken to rectify the injustice.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated October 30, 1974

Signed
Frances Hilliard Brown
Plaintiff in above entitled
Action

This will certify that copies of the above have been sent to:

Mr. Ralph Hartman and/or Mr. Jack Pew — Attorney for Scott & White

Mr. James Holmes, III — Attorney for Baylor-Dallas

Mr. G. A. Searcy Miller — Attorney for Baylor-Houston

Signed
Frances Hilliard Brown

APPENDIX C

In The
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

CIVIL ACTION NO. CA 3-74-115-E

FRANCES HILLIARD BROWN)
VS.
BALYOR UNIVERSITY MEDICAL)
CENTER, ET. AL.)

ORDER

The Court, being informally advised that its order of May 28, 1974, incorrectly states the date upon which it heard the motions to dismiss of the defendants, hereby withdraws said order and enters the following order. Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(a).

Having heard the respective motions to dismiss of the defendants on April 10, 1974, and having considered all pleadings and other matters of record as of that date; and having further considered the record in this matter subsequent to that date, the Court concludes that defendants' motions are well-founded and that it lacks jurisdiction of this cause. Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the motions to dismiss of the parties defendant be granted and that this cause be and is dismissed.

Entered this 3rd day of June, 1974.

Eldon B. Mahon
United States District Judge

APPENDIX D

In the
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
For the Fifth Circuit

October Term, 1973

No. 74-2535
Summary Calendar

D. C. Docket No. CA 3-74-115-E

FRANCES HILLIARD BROWN, Plaintiff-Appellant,
versus
BAYLOR UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER
AT DALLAS, TEXAS, et al., Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Northern District of Texas

Before GEWIN, GODBOLD and CLARK, Circuit Judges.

JUDGMENT

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, and was taken under submission by the Court upon the record and briefs on file, pursuant to Rule 18;

ON CONSIDERATION WHEREOF, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed;

It is further ordered that plaintiff-appellant pay to defendants-appellees, the costs on appeal to be taxed by the Clerk of this Court.

September 27, 1974

Issued as Mandate:

APPENDIX E

In the
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
For the Fifth Circuit

NO. S74-2535

FRANCES HILLIARD BROWN,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER AT DALLAS, TEXAS ET. AL.
Defendants-Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas

(September 27, 1974)

Before GEWIN, GODBOLD and CLARK, Circuit Judges.
PER CURIAM: AFFIRMED. See Local Rule 21.[1]

---

*Rule 18, 5 Cir., *Isbell Enterprises, Inc. v. Citizens Casualty Company of New York, et al*, 5 Cir., 1970, 431 F. 2d 409, Part I.

[1]See N.L.R.B. v. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 5 Cir. 1970, 430 F. 2d 966.

Walter Bennett

MAYA PINES

"No area of scientific research has more profound and disturbing implications for the future than the remarkable advances of both behavioral and biological sciences in understanding the workings of the human mind.

"*The Brain Changers* is a fascinating exploration into our growing knowledge of the mysteries and complexities of the human brain. Maya Pines has done a remarkable job of presenting an imaginative, thought-provoking and very readable account of this little-understood subject." —*Senator Walter Frederick Mondale*

"Maya Pines has conveyed the spirit and enthusiasm of the scientists conducting brain research. We can share the excitement in the discovery of secrets which have eluded us for generations. It is a fascinating process recounted in a fascinating book. If it serves to alert the public to the underlying ethical and moral concerns, our freedom to participate in the ensuing decision will be greatly enhanced. I highly recommend this book!" —*David L. Bazelon, Chief Judge United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia*

"No one until now has brought the separate areas of brain research together so comprehensively and so lucidly. No one before has provided such exquisite balance between the promises and dangers of intervention into the mind. This is a work of scientific savvy and social responsibility that only a sensitive journalist could have written. It will help policy makers to understand what time bombs are ticking away in the laboratories, and may help the researchers further understand the social implications of what they are unleashing. It will help us all enter this new era better informed." —*Daniel Schorr Washington Correspondent, CBS News*

0-15-113700-5

MAYA PINES **THE BRAIN CHANGERS**

HBJ
Harcourt Brace Jovanovich

APPENDIX F

Maya Pines spent her childhood in Paris and London, graduated from barnard college and the Columbia University School of Journalism and worked as a Reporter for Life. She is married and has two children.

The author visited leading research laboratories in various parts of the country to report on new developments.

She is a journalist who specializes in education and science and is a frequent contributor to leading magazines.

THE BRAIN CHANGERS

Scientists and the New Mind Control

MAYA PINES